

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

ABSTRACT

Public Services – I&CAD Dept.– Allegation of irregularities in execution of certain irrigation works in Srikakulam Dist. - Disciplinary proceedings initiated against Sri Y. Chandra Sekhara Rao, AE and Sri P. Ranga Rao, Dy.EE - Inquiry conducted – Charges held as not proved - Finalisation of disciplinary proceedings – Further action dropped - Orders – Issued.

IRRIGATION & C.A.D. (Ser.VII.(V&E-2)) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No. 323

Dated: 13-05-2014

Read the following:

1. From the D.G (Vig. & Enft.) & E.O. Prl. Secy. to Govt., G.A.D Vig. Report No. 21(541/V&E/E1/2007), Dt. 20-02-2008.
2. G.O.Rt. Nos. 747 & 748 I&CAD(Ser.VII(V&E)-2) Dept. dt. 15-06-2010.
3. From Sri Y. Chandrasekhara Rao, AE, Written statement of defence dt. 26-07-2010.
4. From Sri P. Ranga Rao, Dy.EE written statement of defence dt. 22-07-2010.
5. G.O.Rt.No. 1141, I&CAD(Ser.VII(V&E-2) Dept., dt. 15-11-2011.
6. From Sri R. Ramakrishna, Enquiry Officer & Superintending Engineer, IC, Vakhapatnam, Confidential Lr.No. 12 C, dt. 30-05-2012.
7. Govt. Memo No.7719/SerVII(V&E-2)/2008-11, dt. 01-10-2012.
8. From the Superintending Engineer, IC, Bobbili, Confidential Lr.No.11 C, dt. 31-12-2012.
9. Govt. Memo No. 7719/Ser.VII(V&E-2)/2008-12, dt. 15-05-2013.
10. From Sri P. Ranga Rao, Dy.SE, Explanation dt. 20-6-2013.
11. From Sri Y. Chandrasekhara Rao, AE Explanation dt. 27-7-2013.

ORDER:

In the reference 1st read above, it has been brought to the notice of the Government that certain irregularities took place in execution of certain irrigation works in Srikakulam District with a recommendation to initiate suitable departmental action against the officers responsible.

2. After examining the matter, it has been decided to initiate departmental action against the officers responsible for the irregularities in execution of certain irrigation works in Srikakulam District. Accordingly in the reference 2nd read above, disciplinary proceedings have been initiated against the following officers by issuing articles of charges, duly inviting their written statements of defence.

1. Sri P. Ranga Rao, Dy.EE
2. Sri Y. Chandrasekhara Rao, AE

3. In the references 3rd & 4th read above, both the charged officers have submitted their written statements of defence, denying the charges framed against them. After examining the written statements of defence of the charged officers, it has been decided to place the matter before the Enquiry Officer for conducting a detailed inquiry into the charges framed against them as their written statements of defence were found not convincing. Accordingly, in the reference 5th read above, Sri R. Ramakrishna, Superintending Engineer, IC, Visakhapatnam has been appointed as Enquiry Officer.

p.t.o.

::2::

4. In the reference 6th read above, the Enquiry Officer has submitted his inquiry report stating that the charges framed against Sri P. Ranga Rao, Dy.EE and Sri Y. Chandrasekhara Rao, AE are held as not proved.

5. After careful examination of the findings of the Enquiry Officer in the reference 7th read above, the Superintending Engineer, IC, Bobbili has been requested to furnish his report on certain observations. In the reference 8th read above, the Superintending Engineer, IC, Bobbili has submitted his report. After examination of the report it has been decided to deviate from the findings of the Enquiry Officer for the following reasons:-

“the charged officers, in their statements before the Enquiry officer have stated that as per ACDP norms, social audit should be taken up after final payment is made. Final payment was not made and hence social audit could not be taken up. Where as according to the V&E Report, the actual work done portion is very less than the works recorded in the M.Book. Therefore it is proved that the work done portion in the field level not shows the required quantity before final payment it self. Hence, the charge is held as proved.”

6. In the reference 9th read above, a copy of the inquiry report together with the above disagreement factors has been communicated to Sri P. Ranga Rao, Dy.EE and Sri Y. Chandrasekhara Rao, AE with a direction to submit their representations, if any, on the disagreement factors of the Govt. with the findings of the Enquiry Officer.

7. In the references 10th & 11th read above, both the charged officers have submitted their representations with a request to drop further action against them.

8. After examination of the representations of the both the charged officers, it has been decided to accept the same and to drop further action against Sri P. Ranga Rao, the then Dy.EE now Dy. SE and Sri Y. Chandrasekhara Rao, AE. Accordingly Government hereby order to drop further action against Sri P. Ranga Rao, the then Dy.EE now Dy.SE and Sri Y. Chandrasekhara Rao, AE in respect of the disciplinary case relating to the irregularities noticed in execution of certain irrigation works in Srikakulam Dist.

9. The I&CAD(Ser.I&II) Department / the Engineer-in-Chief (AW), I&CAD Department, Hyderabad shall take further necessary action in the matter accordingly.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

**V. NAGI REDDY
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT**

To
The individuals **through** the Engineer-in-Chief (AW), I & CAD Department, Hyderabad.
The Engineer-in-Chief (AW), I & CAD Department, Hyderabad.
The I &CAD(Ser.I&II) Department

Copy to:

The Accountant General, AP, Hyderabad
The Secretary to VC, APVC
The General Administration(V&E) Department
SC/SF

//FORWARDED : BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER